

REMARKS

The last Office Action of March 27, 2003 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-28 are pending in the application. Claim 28 has been amended. No claims have been canceled or added.

It is noted that the drawings are objected to because of applicant's failure to refer to a reference numeral shown in the drawings but not mentioned in the specification.

Claims 3-5, 7-10, 12-16, 20-26 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 3,838,961 to Yogosawa et al.

Claims 2, 6 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yogosawa et al.

Claim 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yogosawa et al., and further in view of Husky (Annual report 1996).

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yogosawa et al., and further in view of T-Line Toggle Injection Molding Machines (Cincinnati pamphlet).

It is noted with appreciation that claims 10 and 11 are allowed, and that claim 17 is indicated allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, applicants wish

to defer amendment to this dependent claim in view of the arguments presented below regarding the independent claims 4-9, 12 and 28.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWING

Applicant has amended the specification to include the reference numeral "45". Withdrawal of the objection to the drawing is thus respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) AND §103(a)

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed to an injection molding machine having a rotary device which is directly mounted onto the machine bed to thereby separate the rotary device from the tie bars. In this way, the tie bars are liberated from any stress caused by the rotary table to thereby allow the realization of a very precise guidance. Reference is made in this context to paragraph [0008] of the instant specification.

Yogasawa et al. describes an injection blow molding machine of a three-platen type with a fixed platen (11), a moving platen (12) and a fixed rear platen (38). A rotary table (supporting member 23) is provided between the fixed and moving platens (11, 12) and rotatable by 180°. The fixed platens (11) and (38)

are mounted to a beam (13) which extends above the platens, whereby a carriage (16) travels along a beam. As described in col. 3, lines 8 to 11 and lines 46 to 48, the rotary table (23) is **suspended** from the carriage (16).

In applying the Yogasawa et al. reference, the Examiner noted that the "base plate 16 [is] supported on a machine bed". Applicant respectfully disagrees. As clearly shown in Fig. 3 and described in the above referred-to passages, the carriage (or base plate 16) is mounted to the horizontal beam (13) which in turn is connected to the fixed platens, while the moving platen can freely move back and forth underneath the beam. Thus, Yogasawa et al. fails to teach or suggest a securement of the base plate and thus of the rotary table on the machine bed. Please note that Yogasawa et al. is directed to a suspended configuration of the fixed platens and the rotary table as opposed to the "standing" configuration of those components upon the machine bed according to the present invention. Please note also that as a consequence of its suspended arrangement, the rotary table is disposed underneath the base plate (16) as opposed of the arrangement of the rotary table of the present invention **upon** the base plate.

In summary, it is noted that the injection blow molding machine of Yogasawa et al. and the injection molding machine according to the present invention are based on different principles as far as the overall construction is concerned (suspended configuration vis a vis standing configuration).

Applicant has amended independent claim 28 to also expressly set forth the securement of the base plate on the machine bed so as to be consistent with the subject matter of the independent claims 4-10, and 12.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that Yogasawa et al. neither teaches nor suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in claims 4-9, 12 and 28.

As for the rejection of the retained dependent claims, these claims depend on claims 4 and 12, respectively share their presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and/or 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and allowance thereof are thus respectfully requested.

CITED REFERENCES

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the newly submitted claims. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that when the Examiner reconsiders the claims in the light of the above comments, he will agree that the invention is in no way properly met or anticipated or even suggested by any of the references however they are considered.

None of the references discloses an injection molding machine in which the fixed platen and the rotary table are supported directly on the machine bed.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen
Agent For Applicant
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: July 18, 2003
350 Fifth Avenue
Suite 4714
New York, N.Y. 10118
(212)244-5500
HMF:ub